

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner objected to claims 126, 127, 129, 130, 132, and 133; rejected claims 79-97, 99-103, 105-107, 125, and 132-134 under 35 U.S.C. § 101; allowed claims 21-39, 41-45, 47-68, 70-74, 76-78, 123, 124, 128, and 131; and stated that claims 79-97, 99-103, 105-107, 125, and 132-134 as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Applicants have amended claims 43, 72, 79-97, 99-103, 105-107, 125, 126, 132, and 134, and canceled claims 127, 130, and 133 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 21-39, 41-45, 47-68, 70-74, 76-97, 99-103, 105-107, 123-126, 128, 129, 131, 132, and 134 remain pending.

I. Objection to claims 126, 127, 129, 130, 132, and 133

Regarding the objection to claim 126, Applicants have amended claim 126 to add “picture,” as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner also states that claims 126, 127, 129, 130, 132, and 133 are duplicate claims. In response, Applicants have canceled claims 127, 130, and 133.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of remaining claims 126, 129, and 132.

II. Rejection of claims 79-97, 99-103, 105-107, 125, and 132-134 under 35 U.S.C. §101

Regarding the rejection of claims 79-97, 99-103, 105-107, 125, and 132-134 under 35 U.S.C. §101, the Examiner states that the claims are “rejected as covering a

¹ The Office Action may contain statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

signal per se, which is not directed towards statutory subject matter” (Office Action at page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nonetheless, Applicants have amended independent claim 79 to recite a “computer program product, tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium for allowing users to make decisions by modeling tradeoffs between personal goals and including instructions that, when executed on a processor, perform a method comprising.” Thus, independent claim 79 positively recites a specific data structure that is tangibly embodied on a computer-readable storage medium. Claim 79 thus falls squarely within the categories of patentable subject matter. Remaining claims 80-97, 99-103, 105-107, 125, 132, and 134 depend from independent claim 79 and, accordingly, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 at least due to their dependence.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims 79-97, 99-103, 105-107, 125, 132, and 134 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 15, 2011

By: Paul M. Gurzo
Paul M. Gurzo
Reg. No. 67,478